

### REMARKS

In an Office Action dated August 26, 2003, (paper no. 4) the Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lou et al. (U.S. patent no. 6,370,666, hereinafter referred to as "Lou"). The Examiner rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lou. The rejections are traversed and reconsideration is hereby respectfully requested.

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of receiving multiple streams, the multiple streams which together form a multimedia session, decoding, based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data, the multiple streams to form multiple decoded streams, and performing Layer 2 functionality upon each of the plurality of decoded streams based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. Nowhere are these limitations taught by Lou.

In the section of Lou cited by the Examiner in rejecting claims 1-26, that is, col. 3, line 50 to col. 5, line 21, Lou teaches (with reference to FIG. 2) a single program source that may source a radio program, or may source audio and video information in the case of a multi-media broadcast. There is nothing in Lou that indicates that the latter is anything other than a single stream, for example, a stream of multiplexed data. The stream sourced by the program source is split into two streams, wherein each stream is then applied to a separate coder (coders 18 and 22). The data output by first coder (18) is interleaved by a first interleaver (20) over a first delay length to produce a first version of the stream for transmission. The data output by second coder (22) is interleaved by a second interleaver (24) over a second delay length that is shorter than the first delay length to produce a second version of the stream for transmission. As a result, the first transmission of the stream is better protected against errors due to fading but takes longer to de-interleave by a receiver, perhaps taking as long as four seconds.

When the data is received by a receiver system of Lou, the receiver system first displays the second version of the stream, which is decoded by a second decoder (70) that corresponds to the second coder (22), in order to minimize the waiting period for a

receiver system user who is tuning to the channel. When the first version of the stream is decoded by a first decoder (64) that corresponds to the first coder (18) and is ready for display, the receiver system then converts over to displaying the first version of the stream. The streams of data encoded and decoded by each coder/decoder pair, that is, coder (18)/decoder (66) and coder (22)/decoder (70), are two complete, self-contained streams of session data, not multiple streams that may be differentiated on a basis of whether the streams contain audio, video, or data. Nowhere does Lou teach that the first coder (18)/decoder (66) pair is for audio and the second coder (22)/decoder (70) pair is for video, or visa versa. To the contrary, the first coder (18)/decoder (66) pair and the second coder (22)/decoder (70) pair encode and decode the same data, just using different delay lengths. Accordingly nowhere does Lou teach the limitations of claim 1 of decoding, based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data, the multiple streams to form multiple decoded streams.

Furthermore, in Lou, the lower layer protocols, that is, Layer 1, Layer 2, and Layer 3, are not aware of whether the contents of the data that they transfer comprise voice, video, or data and do not differentiate the lower layer services provided based on whether the contents the contents of the data that they transfer comprise voice, video, or data. Therefore, nowhere does Lou teach the limitations of claim 1 of performing Layer 2 functionality upon each of the plurality of decoded streams based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. Accordingly, since Lou does not teach the decoding and performing Layer 2 functionality of claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claim 1 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 2-14 depend upon allowable claim 1, the applicants respectfully request that claims 2-14 may now be passed to allowance.

Claims 15 and 23 each includes limitations of splitting a multimedia stream into component pieces based on whether each component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data and applying Layer 2 protocol to the component pieces at the mobile station based upon whether each component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. As noted above, these limitations are not taught by Lou.

Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claims 15 and 23 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 16 and 17 depend upon allowable claim 15, the applicants respectfully request that claims 16 and 17 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 18 includes limitations of decoding, based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data, multiple decoded streams and performing Layer 2 functionality upon each of the decoded streams based upon whether the content of each individual stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. As noted above, these limitations are not taught by Lou. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 18 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 19-20 depend upon allowable claim 18, the applicants respectfully request that claims 19-20 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 21 includes limitations of applying Layer 2 protocol to component pieces of a multimedia stream at a mobile station based upon whether each component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data and applying channel coding to the component pieces at the mobile station based upon whether each component piece comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. As noted above, these limitations are not taught by Lou. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request that claim 21 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claim 22 depends upon allowable claim 21, the applicants respectfully request that claim 22 may now be passed to allowance.

Claim 24 has been amended to provide a mobile station that includes multiple multimedia ports, wherein each multimedia port of the multiple multimedia ports receives a multimedia stream of multiple multimedia streams comprising a multimedia session and routes the received multimedia stream to a coder of multiple coders based on whether the multimedia stream comprises one or more of audio, video, and data. Nowhere does Lou teach such a mobile station. Accordingly, Lou does not teach the limitations of claim 24 and the applicants respectfully request that claim 24 may now be passed to allowance.

Since claims 25-27 depend upon allowable claim 24, the applicants respectfully request that claims 25-27 may now be passed to allowance.

As the applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Respectfully submitted,  
Stephen L. Spear, et al.

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 16 2003

By: 

Steven A. May  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 44,912  
Phone No.: 847/576-3635  
Fax No.: 847/576-3750

OFFICIAL